



# City of Tempe

## MINUTES FOR DEVELOPER FOCUS GROUP MEETING

April 24, 2001  
DS 1 & 2 Conference Room

### REPRESENTATIVES ATTENDING:

Daniel Tilton  
Ed Forest  
Spike Lawrence

Patrick Andersen  
Mike Burke

### STAFF ATTENDING:

Scot Siegel, OTAK

Grace Kelly

## 1. INTRODUCTION

## 2. KEY ISSUES THAT NEED TO BE ADDRESSED IN A REGULATORY UPDATE

- Better integration of standards. Get better information early on from staff in review. Neighborhood vision limits creativity, flexibility, good planning. There doesn't seem to be an understanding of fundamental property rights. There is a way to strangle the process.
- Neighborhood plans are one more cog in the wheel. We want zoning before we go to Design Review and neighborhoods. Process is reverse of what it should be.
- Discussion of neighborhood activism and NIMBYism. Confusion of PAABs (Planning Area Advisory Board) charter and what their purview is.
- We would like to see an anticipated time frame it would take to move a project through.
- We sat and watched a developer at the Design Review Board meeting and staff pulled out a revised site plan that takes away lights that neighbors complained about. Spur-of-the-moment changes/suggestions. Better information needed early from staff and neighbors.
- Poor coordination among Planning, Building safety, CPTED, Planning and Zoning, and Design Review. Need to keep one staff person on through the entire process.
- You do what you were advised to do and then are told to do something different later.
- In R1-PADs, or in MG where a PAD is required, you start with a blank sheet of paper and take chances.

- It is critical to have access to staff through the process. Need consistent information. Building safety problems: Building inspectors pull stuff out of left field, e.g. R1-PAD concrete wall on property lines, inspector shut down job.
- Is there any criteria for continuances? Design Review will continue a project several times just because they too many projects they don't get to.
- In Oregon, there is a 120-day rule for land use approval.
- Take signage out of the Design Review Board process.
- Create a system with one person all the way through for continuity, a project manager to guide a project through from beginning to the end. Problem is a culture that treats developers as a necessary evil rather than a service based culture.
- Problem with communication and poor coordination, e.g. transformers in mixed use development. Utility company says they have to be so many feet from the building and staff says they have to be hidden. They can't be hidden because the utility company says to move them out to the perimeter.
- You should get a set of conditions for approval earlier, rather than the day of the hearing or the day before. You don't have time to react.
- In permitting, you are in 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> review, you come across a minor problem and they holdup the process. A permit should have more flexibility. The ultimate hook is the Certificate of Occupancy and they hold it for minor reasons.
- In city projects, site lighting does not meet CPTED standards.
- CPTED, 5 submittals of site lighting and after they said it was approved, they go through 3 more reviews after that before they sign off.
- Tempe is more flexible than other cities like Chandler, about the same as Scottsdale, still complex -- brain damage.
- 400-unit project – site work each phase is treated as separate drainage area. First inspector says project is going okay, 2<sup>nd</sup> inspector kept saying I can't give any more approvals until the entire site is done.
- Projects that are good examples of infill: Brickyard, Warner Corporate Center.
- Other problem areas: Change height of mechanical penthouse. Nothing can fit within the 12' height limit.
- Get rid of MF Design guidelines.
- Address live/work zoning.